

John W. Munnell, Waynesburg.
 Arthur J. Argall, Braddock.
 John W. Howes, Fayette City.
 Wallace E. Shissler, Johnstown.
 Edward R. Dissinger, Mount Gretna.
 Harry C. Koller, Myerstown.
 Smith M. McCreight, Reynoldsville.
 Carrie A. Fritz, Rimersburg.
 Harvey E. Rogers, Spring City.
 John F. Hawbaker, West Fairview.
 Carl V. Erickson, Arnot.
 Joseph C. Scowden, Tionesta.

RHODE ISLAND

May B. Lamb, Greenville.
 Mabel J. W. Carton, Little Compton.

TENNESSEE

Myrtle E. Hambright, Charleston.

VIRGINIA

Denton T. Walthall, Alberta.
 Ferdinand C. Knight, Alexandria.
 Lela O'N. Scott, Amelia Courthouse.
 Abram K. Sampson, Burkeville.
 James K. Carter, Clinchport.
 Isabelle R. Damron, Clintwood.
 Baxter W. Mock, Damascus.
 Grace C. Collins, Drakes Branch.
 Troy D. Rorrer, Dublin.
 Louise J. Nottingham, Eastville.
 John N. Coffman, Edinburg.
 Harvey P. McCary, Esmont.
 Samuel G. Allen, Front Royal.
 Holdway E. Lane, Gate City.
 Nellie D. Swan, Gordonsville.
 Robert E. Berry, Green Bay.
 John W. Rodgers, Hampden Sidney.
 Phillip L. Harrington, Independence.
 Susie F. Jarratt, Jarratt.
 Augustus R. Morris, Jetersville.
 Georgie H. Osborne, Keysville.
 John W. Ketron, jr., Lebanon.
 Merle C. Ralls, Midland.
 Clinton L. Wright, Norfolk.
 Walter C. Franklin, Pamplin.
 Albert L. Taylor, Parksley.
 Charles V. Tucker, Phenix.
 Patrick J. Riley, Portsmouth.
 Arthur E. Lybolt, Purcellville.
 Joseph W. Stewart, Richmond.
 Edward S. Barnitz, Salem.
 Elton H. Finks, Somerset.
 Robert S. Bowers, Timberville.
 Roy M. Cleek, Warm Springs.
 Charles E. Fulgham, Windsor.
 Charlie R. Fisher, Wytheville.

WISCONSIN

Leonard A. Krueger, Dalton.
 Earl E. Murdock, Gresham.
 David R. Fryklund, Prentice.
 Anthony F. Ritchie, Winchester.
 Tom C. Snyder, Belmont.
 John A. Mathys, Casco.
 John F. Lambert, Crandon.
 Clyde C. Ellis, Elkhart Lake.
 Albert F. Hahn, Humbird.
 Eugene B. Williams, Hurley.
 Mabel A. Dunwiddie, Juda.
 Hazel I. Hicks, Linden.
 Alex P. Gertschen, Marathon.
 Guy G. Nelson, Palmyra.
 Laura K. Duerrwaechter, South Germantown.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 22, 1926

POSTMASTER

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph W. Mahon to be postmaster at Langdon, in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, December 22, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Glory be to Thee, O Lord, most high. Vouchsafe this day to keep us without sin. Open up the springs of gratitude in all our breasts and may we praise Thee. We would have our hearts attuned to the angels' song, "Glory to God in the highest—on earth peace, good will toward men." O let it live on until the whole earth resounds with its blessed music. May all nations take it up until it becomes coextensive with the being of man. The Lord look upon our country to tune its great heart to thanksgiving and praise. Bless our homes and absent loved ones with good health and give them the fullest cup of good cheer and Christmas joy. In the glow of the glorious advent help us to remember those who thread the shadows of misfortune, and may we help them. As the wise men of old presented their best gifts to the world's Savior, so may we. When the years of our course are run, may His star arise above our waiting brows and light our way to the Father's house. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COLORADO RIVER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] ask leave to file minority views on the bill (H. R. 9826) relating to the Colorado River Basin. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 11616) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44):

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on the legislative day of December 22, 1926, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, January 3, 1927.

The message also announced that the Senate had concurred in the amendments of the House to bills to the following titles:

S. 3615. An act for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the Spanish-American War because of misrepresentation of age;

S. 3728. An act to grant to the State of New York and the Seneca Nation of Indians jurisdiction over the taking of fish and game within the Allegany, Cattaraugus, and Oil Spring Indian Reservations; and

S. 4153. An act to provide for enlarging and relocating the United States Botanic Gardens, and for other purposes.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 11616 be taken from the Speaker's table for consideration.

Mr. MAPES and Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the gentleman's request.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 11616 be taken from the Speaker's table for present consideration of the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think he ought to recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The Chair thinks there was a very definite understanding based on the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] that no action would be taken with regard to the river and harbor bill specifically or any other bill except of a purely formal character. The Chair thinks such action as this would be far from a mere formal procedure, and whether or not there may be some Member present who desires to object, there are a number of Members who have gone away with this understanding in mind, and the Chair feels he ought not to recognize the gentleman for the purpose he indicates.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I be heard on that question, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was not in the Chamber when the conversation to which the Speaker refers was held between the majority leader and the minority leader. I heard very shortly after the conversation what was said by the leaders of the two sides. I subsequently had an interview with the majority leader and the minority leader. They both said that the matter would be taken up a second time that day, and that they would make a new statement with regard to the matter. I was subsequently informed by the majority leader that they did so take it up and that they did make a subsequent statement which would make the matter in order. The majority leader is here, the minority leader is away, and I would ask the majority leader to state what the facts are.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD speaks for itself.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say that we can clear the atmosphere here by having the request put, because I certainly will object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks, regardless of whether the gentleman is going to object or not, it is his duty to carry out what, in his opinion, is the express understanding of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman's request, it is simply that the matter be laid before the House. The gentleman has not made any motion, and no action will be taken if objection is made to laying the matter before the House at this time. Am I correct that the request is only that the matter be laid before the House?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no; it involves more than that.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that if the matter was laid before the House there might be a motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say very frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is what I had in mind, and I understood that was in perfect accord with the agreement as expressed to the House by the two leaders. If I am in error as to that, of course, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was present when the understanding was reached and has read very carefully the RECORD.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is not any question about the fact that there was such an agreement. All I called attention to, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that I understood that it was subsequently modified. If I am wrong about that, then I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this matter of sufficient importance, perhaps, to read some of the colloquy. When the matter was originally brought up, the gentleman from Connecticut replying to the inquiry of the minority leader as to whether the river and harbor bill would be taken up to-day if it came over and as to whether there was a possibility of its being messaged over in time for action, said:

As to that I do not know. With the understanding that we have just had, if that bill should come to the House later than to-morrow, I should not feel inclined to ask that any action be taken upon it until after the holidays, unless the action were of a merely formal character.

The Chair thinks that agreeing to the Senate amendments is by no means a purely formal matter, as they involve matters of great importance and controversy. Furthermore, I doubt if any gentleman has been able to read all the amendments adopted by the Senate at a rather late hour last evening. The Chair thinks this would clearly go beyond the understanding of the House.

Mr. TILSON. Will the Speaker also read the modification to which the gentleman from New York refers, which, in my judgment, does not substantially change the original statement?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks that the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] later in the afternoon do not change the spirit of the understanding, and, by the way, that was at a time just before adjournment when there were hardly any Members in the Chamber at all, whereas the original agreement was had when there was at least a quorum present. The Chair thinks that many gentlemen may have gone away with the understanding that no such action, so important as agreeing to the Senate amendments to the river and harbor bill, would be taken up to-day, and the Chair feels he must protect them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I simply want to make it perfectly plain, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the committee, in making this motion did it after conference with the majority leader

and with the understanding on his part as imparted to him by the majority leader that the original agreement had been modified and that the request was in order. I want to make it absolutely plain that there was no effort or intention on the part of the chairman to do anything in contravention of any understanding, and that he thought he was acting entirely in accordance with the understanding and would not have thought of moving otherwise; and, Mr. Speaker, after saying that, I withdraw my request.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for a minute in order to make the matter clear, for it is due to both the gentleman from Tennessee and myself. In a subsequent colloquy to that which has been read by the Speaker it was made perfectly clear that contested matters—which would mean matters that would bring on a vote or a roll call—would be avoided, if possible, because it was hoped by many of the Members that they would get away from Washington on yesterday, and many of them did so. It was partly to protect those Members from being absent on an important roll call that it was agreed that no contested matter should be taken up. I emphasize "contested matter" because that is what I had in mind as a matter that would bring on a roll call. If there is anything that can be done by unanimous consent, if the bill could be agreed upon by unanimous consent, I should not regard it as breaking that agreement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Connecticut will bear me out that when I called at his office he advised me that several Members had been to see him who had been included in those who opposed the bill as it left the House who said that they were not opposed to the bill now.

Mr. TILSON. No; I think it fairer to say that they said it was better than when it left the House; in other words, that the Senate had improved the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. HUDDLESTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I wish to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Connecticut. His construction would make it absolutely necessary that all Members stay here during the holidays, because if it dwindles down to two or three they can do what they like if the Speaker should change what appears to me to be a very proper attitude on the subject. The agreement was to enable Members to go home and not have to stay here and watch things. I think the gentleman from Connecticut should reconsider his construction of the agreement.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is another matter coming up before the day is over I hope that will show the gentleman from Alabama that we should not insist upon his construction of the language. The Senate is considering the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, and it is hoped that it will pass the Senate within two or three hours. It would be a very great convenience, and in the public interest, if that bill might be sent to conference before the holidays.

I think it would not be in contravention of the agreement made to send the bill to conference by unanimous consent, and I hope that it may be done.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman has said that a proper construction is that if he could get it done by unanimous consent it is proper to bring it up, and that is what I protest against.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he will not recognize any Member to-day to ask unanimous consent to take up a matter that is at all controversial, a matter which is in any degree controversial. He will recognize a request to send a bill to conference, for he thinks that is purely a formal matter.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the Speaker's position, but note ought to be made of the optimism of some of the friends of the bill if they think the river and harbor bill is not controversial. I want to ask the Speaker to make sure that I understand the situation if it is his position that he will not recognize anyone to ask unanimous consent to have the river and harbor bill sent to conference until after the holidays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he would recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent to send the bill to conference. The Chair draws a distinction between asking to send the bill to conference and asking to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I object. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has heard no such request.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understood the gentleman from Michigan was preferring such a request.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Michigan asked the Chair whether he would recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent to send the bill to conference.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from New York is not asking to send the bill to conference, and I would object to anybody else making the request.

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print some views on this controversy in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DENISON. Is there anything controversial about the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. CHALMERS. No; I will attempt to pour oil on the troubled waters. It is expressing my views of the provision in the river and harbor bill to construct the Illinois project. I withdraw former objections to it and give my reasons why.

Mr. DENISON. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I am asking time to review briefly the so-called compromise in this bill on the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan by the Chicago Sanitary District. The Members of Congress representing the Great Lakes interests yielded to the Senate amendment in the pending rivers and harbors bill providing for a modification of the Illinois River project because we felt that this paragraph as given in the Senate reprint of the rivers and harbors bill in no way could be construed to mean congressional approval of diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin to the Mississippi Valley.

The Illinois River is formed 100 miles southwest of Lake Michigan by the confluence of the Des Plaines and the Kankakee Rivers. It flows generally southwest and empties into the Mississippi at Grafton, about 223 miles distant from Utica. The major portion of this river was ordered improved to a 7-foot depth in 1879, many years before the water steal was even thought out. In this bill we are simply sinking the project depth 2 feet, making it 9 feet deep instead of 7 feet. There is plenty of water in the Illinois River furnished by nature to run this modified project without taking a quart of water out of the Great Lakes. I have discussed this with the Chief of Engineers, and he assured me that the above statement is true. This assurance came after he had opportunity to consult his experts.

It takes 1,000 second-feet or less of water to operate this project. I call your attention to page 1387 of the Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for 1925, part 1. You will find there that there are approximately 1,500 second-feet of water throughout the entire length of the Illinois River at low water. The flow varies from this amount at low water to 130,000 second-feet at the mouth of the river at extreme flood stage.

Why should there not be plenty of water? This river receives all of the water from the Kankakee and Des Plaines. It drains an area of about 27,900 square miles and receives the water from all the creeks and rivers in that vast region.

Some of the best lawyers say that the language used in establishing the modified Illinois River project can not be construed to the directly or indirectly congressional approval of diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

Please note also that this understanding of "the intent of Congress" is not confined to our side of this controversy. Senator DENEEN, Republican, of Illinois, is reported as hailing the approval of the amendment. The following is quoted from his remarks:

The situation in regard to the water-diversion controversy will be left exactly as if the bill has never been passed.

I am placing this statement in the RECORD so that they may have a bearing upon the intent of Congress in passing this law. We do not approve diversion. We do not mention the subject except to provide—

That nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing any diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

BOULDER CANYON RECLAMATION PROJECT ON THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw to the attention of the Members of the House legislation which has been pending in Congress for a number of years to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, and especially to House bill 9826, which was favorably reported

to the House to-day from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and is now on the calendar.

The damage resulting from floods in this region amounts to millions of dollars annually, and millions of dollars have been spent by the Government, the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and irrigation districts in construction of levees to protect the lives and property of those living in that section of the country, but the relief afforded has been only of a temporary and uncertain character. The millions of tons of silt deposited by the river raises the bed of the stream from 10 to 12 inches each year, which results in constantly increasing the danger of overflow, the menacing of the safety of the inhabitants, and the destruction of farms, orchards, and communities.

The executive and legislative branches of the Government have been repeatedly appealed to for cooperation with the people whose lives and property are in constant jeopardy for some permanent relief, and on August 19, 1921, President Harding approved an act to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming respecting the disposition and apportionment of waters of the Colorado River. The act authorized the President of the United States to designate a suitable person to participate in the negotiations, and he appointed Hon. Herbert Hoover as his representative.

A commissioner was appointed by the governors of the respective States, and the commission immediately began its deliberations, and on November 24, 1922, the Colorado compact was signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

The pending legislation provides for the construction of a high dam at or near Boulder Canyon, in the Colorado River, for flood protection, the building of a power plant to produce a revenue to repay the Government for expenditures to be made, and the construction of a canal within the confines of the United States to afford a stable water supply for irrigation purposes to the Imperial Valley, where over 60,000 people reside, and also to supply water to about 450,000 acres of arid land which World War veterans desire to enter.

The importance and necessity of this great development was presented to Congress by the President in his message of the 7th instant, as follows:

In previous messages I have referred to the national importance of the proper development of our water resources. The great project of extension of the Mississippi system, the protection and development of the lower Colorado River, are before Congress, and I have previously commented upon them. I favor the necessary legislation to expedite these projects.

On March 17, 1924, the present Secretary of the Interior, Dr. Hubert Work, commented as follows:

The Colorado River has been under observation, survey, and study, and the subject of reports to Congress since the close of the Civil War. More than \$350,000 have been expended by the Bureau of Reclamation since the Kinkaid Act of May 18, 1920. More than \$2,000,000 have been expended by other agencies of the Government. The time has arrived when the Government should decide whether it will proceed to convert this natural menace into a national resource. (Hearings on H. R. 2903, 68th Cong. 1st sess., p. 818.)

The proposed improvement is a great constructive development which not only will end the river's "menace," but will at the same time put its water to work in the interest of society, reclaiming new lands, creating new homes, building up new industries, adding to the wealth of the Nation, and the well-being of a considerable portion of its people.

This legislation and the project it authorizes have received the most careful study and earnest consideration during the last three Congresses, and volumes of testimony have been compiled by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. During this Congress weeks have been devoted to the hearing of testimony respecting the project and to the consideration of the provisions of legislation authorizing it.

The committee had before it the report of hearings held during the Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses, comprising thousands of pages of testimony, as well as extensive and detailed reports by Federal agencies charged with the duty of studying the Colorado River. Many members of the committee have inspected the site of the great dam which the bill authorizes, the section of Mexico through which the canal passes, the Imperial Valley, which is the region most menaced by the river's flood waters, as well as other sections of the Southwest which will be directly affected by the development. It may be said with perfect accuracy that no project of internal improvement has ever come before Congress backed by such extended and exhaustive consideration as has been accorded to this one.

Pending legislation authorizes works "for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin," but it repre-

sents a vitally important step in the plan by which the waters of this great river are apportioned in a fashion which will protect and safeguard the interests of States and communities far removed from the works to be built, thus permitting these States and communities to look to the future with the assurance which established water rights give to regions dependent upon irrigation for their agricultural existence.

While the works proposed are stupendous in magnitude, a financial plan has been worked out with the assistance of the Secretary of the Treasury and incorporated in the bill, under which their cost will not burden the Federal Treasury nor weigh upon the general taxpayer. The financial burden of the development is placed upon its immediate beneficiaries. Thus section 4 (b) of the bill provides:

(b) Before any money is appropriated or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues, by contract or otherwise, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate, in his judgment, to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of said works incurred by the United States and for the repayment, within 50 years from the date of the completion of the project, of all amounts advanced to the fund under subdivision (b) of section 2, together with interest thereon.

The moneys advanced to the fund referred to embrace not only moneys to cover the cost of the work but interest on the same during the period of construction. Under the specific provisions of the bill, after the works are completely paid for, with interest, the Government will still forever own the portions thereof susceptible of producing revenue and will be free to so use the works that they may be made to bring a return.

BOULDER CANYON RECLAMATION PROJECT

The subject falls naturally into eight divisions, as follows:

- Part I. The Colorado River and its characteristics, and the Imperial Valley.
- Part II. The Boulder Canyon project—what it is, its development, and plan.
- Part III. The Colorado River compact; apportionment of waters between the States.
- Part IV. Flood control.
- Part V. Reclamation and the all-American Canal.
- Part VI. Domestic water.
- Part VII. Power.
- Part VIII. Form of bill.

PART I. THE COLORADO RIVER AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS, AND THE IMPERIAL VALLEY

To grasp the urgent need of "protection" to the lower Colorado River Basin and to envision the wonderful possibilities of "development" calls for a brief statement of the characteristics of the Colorado River as well as something of the Imperial Valley in California.

The Colorado is one of the great rivers of the United States. Rising in the high mountains of Colorado and Wyoming, it flows through these States and the States of Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California. It forms part of the boundary between Arizona and Nevada and between Arizona and California. After crossing the boundary line between the United States and Mexico it flows some 50 miles through the latter country and discharges into the head of the Gulf of California.

Actual measurements, taken over a period of 25 years, show an average annual discharge of water by the river of approximately 17,000,000 acre-feet. The river varies greatly in flow, both annual and seasonal. One year the discharge may be as great as 25,000,000 acre-feet; another year it may be as low as 9,000,000 acre-feet. Even more striking is the seasonal variation. In flood the discharge at times is more than 200,000 cubic feet per second. In August, September, and October the river is at low flow. Frequently this flow is as low as 2,500 cubic feet per second; on September 11, 1924, it was less than 1,300 cubic feet per second.

The rim of the upper drainage basin of the river is composed largely of high mountain ranges. Melting snows from these ranges and the rainfall increase its volume. The lower portion of the basin is composed of hot arid plains of low altitude, broken by short mountain groups. The central portion consists of a high plateau, through which the river runs for hundreds of miles in a deep and narrow canyon.

As the river flows through the canyon region it picks up tremendous quantities of silt. Much of this is discharged in the lower reaches of the river, the annual discharge below Yuma being over 100,000 acre-feet, or more than 161,000,000 cubic yards, an amount equal in volume to the total excavations made by the United States in constructing the Panama Canal.

Imperial Valley lies in the southeasterly portion of California. On the south it is bounded by the Mexican line; its

easterly edge is about 40 miles west of the Colorado River. On the American side of the line it is separated from the river by a range of low sandhills, which lie between the river channel and the valley floor. Centuries ago the Imperial Valley was the northerly end of the Gulf of California. The tremendous quantities of silt carried by the river gradually built a great delta across the gulf, completely separating the northern from the southern end of the gulf. Evaporation unwatered the region thus cut off and left Imperial Valley. Thus Imperial Valley lies like a great saucer, with the Colorado running along its rim from 100 to 300 feet above the valley's floor.

This valley secures its sole water supply from the Colorado River through a canal starting from the river just above the international boundary and thence running for many miles through Mexico before reentering the valley.

Imperial Valley has a population of over 60,000 people, many well-built cities, over 400,000 acres of cultivated farms, property values of over \$100,000,000.

As irrigation uses have increased up the river, and particularly as irrigation has increased in Mexico, the water available for irrigation in the valley during the period of low flow of the river has grown less and less.

Imperial Valley during June, July, and August of each year is threatened by destruction by flood. In September and October it is threatened by and has actually suffered from drought.

PART II. THE BOULDER CANYON PROJECT—WHAT IT IS, ITS DEVELOPMENT AND PLAN

THE PROJECT—WHAT IT IS

The works authorized are—

(1) A dam 550 feet in height at Boulder or Black Canyon where the river forms the boundary between Arizona and Nevada. Not only do these canyons furnish a wonderful natural dam site but here is an equally wonderful natural reservoir site, where there will be impounded 26,000,000 acre-feet of water. The estimated cost of the dam is \$41,500,000, or but \$1.62 per acre-foot of storage.

(2) Power plants to utilize the water power created at the dam. (The construction of plants is left optional with the Secretary. He may, instead, lease the water power.) Five hundred and fifty thousand firm or constant horsepower will be available, or 1,000,000 horsepower on a 55 per cent load factor. The estimated cost of installing plants of 1,000,000 horsepower capacity is \$31,500,000, or \$31.50 per installed horsepower, while the cost per installed horsepower of both dam and plants is but \$73.

(3) An all-American canal from the river to the Imperial Valley. The estimated cost of the canal is \$31,000,000.

Interest during construction on the cost of these works is estimated at \$21,000,000, which, added to their cost, makes \$125,000,000, the amount of the authorized appropriation. The item of interest during construction does not, of course, represent an active appropriation and, should the Secretary elect not to build power plants, the cost of construction of the works would be reduced to \$72,500,000, with a corresponding reduction of the interest during construction item.

PURPOSES OF THE PROJECT

This project is wisely shaped to accomplish a variety of purposes—

First. It will end the flood menace of the lower river. The great reservoir will catch and hold the flood waters until they can be released at a rate which the river channel can accommodate with safety. The plans of the Government contemplate that 8,000,000 acre-feet of the capacity of the reservoir will be set aside for flood-control purposes.

Second. It will end an intolerable situation which now exists in Imperial Valley. This valley now secures its sole water supply by a canal which runs for some 60 miles through Mexico. The all-American canal will furnish a substitute for this and at the same time carry the water at an elevation to irrigate additional land, mostly public, lying about the rim of the cultivated area. Storage at the dam will provide sufficient water for the irrigation of Imperial Valley and these additional lands. At present Imperial Valley is subject to serious water shortages during the low flow of the river.

Third. Flood waters will be conserved at the dam and reservoir, which, besides providing for irrigation needs below, will provide for a much-needed and urgent domestic water supply for rapidly growing cities of southern California.

Fourth. The dam and reservoir will, incidentally, create a large amount of hydroelectric power, from the disposal of which the project will be in large part financed.

Under the operation of the project the flow of the river below the dam will be regulated and even. With its flow unregulated, the river can not be successfully used as a highway for

commerce. In its regulated form it will be susceptible to use by power boats and other small craft. The great reservoir will, of course, be susceptible of navigation.

Certain international complications now existing will doubtless be brought to a satisfactory solution through the construction of this project. These will be referred to in Part VI of the report.

LOCATION FOR DAM

The overwhelming weight of opinion favors the Boulder or Black Canyon site. These two sites are close together and are frequently termed the upper and lower Boulder Canyon sites. A dam at either site will inundate practically the same territory. Natural conditions at this point are extremely favorable for the construction of a great dam at a minimum of cost. An immense natural reservoir site is here available. A development at this point will fully and adequately serve all purposes—flood control, reclamation, domestic water, and power. It is the nearest available site to the power market, an important element from a business or financial standpoint.

As said by Secretary Hoover:

I believe the largest group of those who have dealt with the problem, both engineers and business folk, have come to the conclusion that there should be a high dam erected somewhere in the vicinity of Black Canyon. That is known usually as the Boulder Canyon site, but nevertheless it is actually Black Canyon. The dam so erected is proposed to serve the triple purpose of power, flood control, and storage. Perhaps I should state them in a different order—flood control, storage, and power—as power is a by-product of these other works.

There are theoretical engineering reasons why flood-control and storage works should be erected farther up the river and why storage works should be erected farther down the river; and I have not any doubt that given another century of development on the river all these things will be done. The problem that we have to consider, however, is what will serve the next generation in the most economical manner, and we must take capital expenditure and power markets into consideration in determining this. I can conceive the development of probably 15 different dams on the Colorado River, the securing of 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 horsepower; but the only place where there is an economic market for power to-day, at least of any consequence, is in southern California, the economical distance for the most of such dams being too remote for that market. No doubt markets will grow in time so as to warrant the construction of dams all up and down the river. We have to consider here the problem of financing; that in the erection of a dam—or of any works for that matter—we must make such recovery as we can on the cost, and therefore we must find an immediate market for power. For that reason it seems to be that logic drives us as near to the power market as possible, and that it therefore takes us down into the lower canyon. (Hearings on S. Res. 320, 68th Cong., 2d sess., p. 601.)

UNITED STATES THE PROPER AGENCY TO UNDERTAKE DEVELOPMENT

Because the Colorado River is an interstate and international stream, and because of the various conflicting uses of water such as for flood control, reclamation, domestic water, and power generation, the Government is the proper and logical agency to undertake this development. It is well equipped for this purpose. The Reclamation Service has had wide experience in large dam construction. This idea was well expressed by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of January 12, 1926, on the project, where he said:

Interstate and international rights and interests involved, the diversified benefits from the construction of these works, the waiting necessities of cities for increased water supplies, the large development of latent agricultural resources, the protection of those already developed, and the immense industrial benefits which may come from the production of cheap power, which together appear to render the construction and subsequent control of these works a measure of such economic and social importance that no agency but the Federal Government should be entrusted with the protection of rights or distribution of its opportunities. All uses can be coordinated and the fullest benefits realized only by their centralized control.

A similar view was voiced by the President in a telegram to C. C. Teague, of date October 7, 1924, in which he said:

The major purposes of the works to be constructed * * * involve two fundamental questions which must always remain in public control—that is, flood control and the provision of immense water storage necessary to hold the seasonal and annual flow so as to provide for the large reclamation possibilities in both California and Arizona.

These considerations seem to me to dominate all others and to point logically to the Federal Government as the agency to undertake the construction of a great dam at Boulder Canyon or some other suitable locality * * *. I should indeed look with great pride on the consummation of this one of our greatest national improvements within my administration. (Hearings on S. 727, 68th Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.)

This thought was also clearly expressed by the late President Harding in the manuscript of an address which he expected to deliver at San Diego. He was prevented from delivering this address by death. He said:

Such a gigantic operation may not be accomplished within the resources of the local communities. It is my view, and I believe the accepted view of a large part of our people, that the initial capital for the installation of these engineering works must be provided by the American people as a whole, and truly the American people as a whole benefit from such investment. The addition to our national assets of so productive a unit benefits, not alone the local community created by it, but also, directly and indirectly, our entire national life. * * * I should, indeed, be proud if during my administration I could participate in the inauguration of this great project by affixing my signature to the proper legislation by Congress through which it might be launched. I should feel that I had some small part in the many thousands of fine American homes that would spring forth from the desert during the course of my lifetime as the result of such an act and in the extension of these fine foundations of our American people. (Hearings H. R. 2903, 68th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1884, 1885.)

HOW THE PROJECT TOOK FORM

The project is one of gradual growth and development, the result of recommendations from Presidents, from Roosevelt to Coolidge, of hearings before Congress running back many years, of technical investigations and reports covering every aspect of the river, its problems, and its development.

As early as January 12, 1907, President Roosevelt submitted to Congress a message upon the problems of the lower Colorado River, in which he outlined and urged a development which will become a reality upon the completion of the project here authorized. Thus he said:

The construction work required would be: The main canal, some 60 miles in length, from Laguna Dam into the Imperial Valley; the repair and partial construction of the present distribution system in the valley and its extension to other lands, mainly public; diversion dams and distribution systems in the Colorado River valley, and provision for supplementing the natural flow of the river by means of such storage reservoirs as may be necessary. This would provide for the complete irrigation of 300,000 acres in the Imperial Valley and for 400,000 acres additional in the United States in the valley of the Colorado in Arizona and California.

On February 16, 1918, by contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the Imperial irrigation district provision was made for the creation of an all-American canal board to consist of one member named by the Reclamation Service, one by the district, and one by the University of California, such board to investigate the feasibility of an all-American canal. The engineers selected were Dr. Elwood Mead, now Commissioner of Reclamation, W. W. Schlect, and C. E. Grunsky.

This board reported on July 22, 1919, recommending an all-American canal, and legislation was presented in the Sixty-sixth Congress to carry out its recommendation. Extensive hearings were held; but Congress not being entirely satisfied with the data available, and particularly because no concrete plan for storage was before it, on May 18, 1920, passed the so-called Kinkaid Act, directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation of the problems of the lower Colorado and report back to Congress his recommendations as to the proper plan of development. An appropriation of \$20,000 was made. As investigations proceeded this was supplemented by appropriations from the Imperial irrigation district, Coachella Valley, Palo Verde Valley, Arizona, Los Angeles, Pasadena, and other interested communities, aggregating \$171,000.

A preliminary report was completed in the early part of 1921. Public hearings on this were had by the Secretary of the Interior, and on February 28, 1922, his formal report recommending in substance the project here authorized was transmitted to Congress. This report is published as Senate Document No. 142 of the Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.

Bills were introduced in both Houses to carry out the recommendations of the report, and hearings were had.

Passage of legislation (the forerunner of the present bill) was recommended by the Interior Department in a communication to the House Committee on Irrigation on June 14, 1922. (Hearings on H. R. 11449, 67th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4.)

It was again urged by the department in a communication to the House committee on March 17, 1924. (Hearings on H. R. 2903, 68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 818.)

The project was favorably reported on by engineers of the Reclamation Service in February, 1924, in a voluminous report, which has been before this committee and considered by it but which has not been published. This report contains a wealth of technical data on irrigable areas, various plans of development of the river, cost estimates, and similar data.

On January 12, 1926, the Interior Department again recommended the project in a report, to which reference is herein frequently made. (Hearings on S. Res. 320, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 867.)

The financial plan contained in the bill was prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury. (Report to House committee.)

This summary, by no means complete, of the various reports and recommendations upon this project indicates the great care and long study which it has received from various Government departments and agencies and from congressional committees. It is a result of all these that the project has taken its present form.

PLAN OF FINANCING

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report of January 12, 1926, gives his estimate of the financial working of the project, as follows:

Capital investment

Estimated cost for—	
26,000,000 acre-foot reservoir	\$41,500,000
1,000,000 horsepower development	31,500,000
The all-American canal	31,000,000
Interest during construction on above five years, at 4 per cent	21,000,000
Total	125,000,000

Annual operation

Estimated gross revenues from—	
Sale 3,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours, power at three-tenths cent	\$10,800,000
Storage and delivery of water for irrigation and domestic purposes	1,500,000
Total	12,300,000
Estimated fixed annual charges for—	
Operation and maintenance, storage, and power	700,000
Operation and maintenance, all-American canal	500,000
Interest on \$125,000,000 at 4 per cent	5,000,000
Total	6,200,000

Estimated annual surplus, \$6,100,000, or thought to be sufficient to repay the entire cost in 25 years.

ESTIMATES ARE CAREFULLY MADE

The cost estimates given by the Secretary of the Interior are the result of long and painstaking studies of that department. Mr. F. E. Weymouth, then chief engineer of the Reclamation Service, under whose personal supervision the major part of the studies were made, testified before the committee as follows:

We have on our consulting staff Mr. A. J. Wiley and Mr. Louis Hill, and we have consulted them regularly in reference to this whole problem. We have had several engineering board meetings to consider the various phases of the problem, especially in reference to types of dams and methods of construction and cost of all that sort of thing. They were outside of our regular engineering force.

Asked about the engineers in his organization, he stated:

Mr. Walker Young, who is present to-day, has had charge of the investigations in Boulder Canyon for about three and a half years. Mr. Young had more to do than anybody else in the actual working out of the detailed designs and estimates, but he at all times had the advice of our chief designing engineer, Mr. J. L. Savage, whose headquarters are now in Denver, and also of the whole designing force of that office.

Mr. Savage has under his charge about 25 or 30 engineers of all kinds. * * * In addition to that we have had the assistance of Mr. Gaylord, who was until very recently our chief electrical engineer, and his assistants, and Mr. Dibble and his assistants. In the study of the water supply the irrigable areas, and the control of the river for flood or for power purposes, Mr. Debblor, who is here to-day, has made most of those studies.

We had Mr. Ransome, a geologist of the Geological Survey, make a very exhaustive geologic examination and report on the Boulder Canyon reservoir and dam site, and Mr. Jenison, of the Geological Survey, also assisted him. The Bureau of Standards has done a lot of work for the service in testing materials for construction. There is another man that I forgot to mention, a very valuable engineer and geologist, Mr. Homer Hamlin. The most work that has been done perhaps was done by Mr. Arthur P. Davis while he was the director of the service.

Well, we have utilized our regular forces a great deal; Mr. James Munn, who was formerly a contractor and is, perhaps, one of the best construction men in the country—we have had his advice, especially in reference to unit costs that we have used in the estimates.

Concerning the advisory board, composed of Mr. Wiley and Mr. Hill, he said:

We have considered with them each step that we have taken as it came up and it has had their approval. (Hearings on H. R. 2903, 68th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 741-743.)

GOVERNMENT FULLY ASSURED A RETURN OF ITS ADVANCES

Not only does the bill specifically require the complete pre-financing of the project, but the nature of the agencies which will underwrite the cost are such that there will never be any question of the prompt and businesslike meeting of all financial obligations. These agencies will be of established solvency. The Imperial irrigation district, an established going district, will be the largest contractor for irrigation water. Cities with an assessed valuation of over a billion dollars will contract for the storage of domestic water and for power to pump this water to an elevation of some 1,300 feet. Power, the great financial asset of the project, will be contracted for with such applicants as the States of Nevada and Arizona, private utilities like the Southern California Edison Co., and cities like Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, and Riverside. Those agencies are announced applicants for power. Their contracts will be good.

INDORSEMENTS OF PROJECT

Besides numerous indorsements of State organizations and counties, cities, and other organizations of more or less local nature, including the Boulder Dam Association, an organization composed of some 200 public bodies in California, Nevada, and Arizona, it has been indorsed by the following national organizations: National Association of Real Estate Boards, American Legion, National United Spanish War Veterans, American Federation of Labor, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. The latter national organization reaffirmed its approval as recently as the 8th of the present month.

PART III. COLORADO RIVER COMPACT—APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS BETWEEN THE STATES

In 1920 Congress, by the Kinkaid Act, directed an investigation of the lower Colorado River. This indicated the serious purpose of the Federal Government to proceed with the development of the river. As works on the lower river would be certain to create permanent water rights, a movement was started by States in the upper drainage basin of the river to settle between the States rights respecting the waters of the river, so that these would not be affected or impaired by any development which might be authorized.

Commissioners were appointed by the seven States to negotiate an interstate treaty or compact. The Hon. Herbert Hoover was named to represent the Federal Government. Various conferences were held, and finally, on November 24, 1922, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., an agreement or compact was signed dividing the waters of the river, not amongst the States, but between the upper and the lower basin States, the upper basin States being Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the lower basin States being Arizona, California, and Nevada.

Early in 1923 the legislatures of all of these States except Arizona ratified this compact. Arizona, however, has thus far refused to ratify.

In 1925 a six-State ratification was suggested by upper-basin States, thus making the compact effective as to all the States, except Arizona. The four upper-basin States and Nevada promptly acceded to this plan. California, however, took the position that its assent to the compact on either a six or seven State basis, must be a matter of exchange for large storage and become effective only upon the authorization of such storage.

Perhaps half the time of the committee has been occupied in the consideration of this compact, and the bearing of the situation adverted to, upon the project.

Finally there emerged from the extended discussion a plan, which is expressed in the bill, for handling the interstate water-supply situation. This provides that nothing shall be done under the bill until at least the six-State ratification becomes effective. Various devices are in the bill to supplement the six-State ratification and protect the upper-basin States, these devices having been worked out and presented by representatives of these States. The bill gives the essential congressional approval of the compact upon either a six or seven State basis. As has been well said, the bill "enthrones the Colorado River compact."

This arrangement or plan is objected to by certain groups in the State of Arizona, but the committee has felt that in view of the somewhat uncertain conditions in that State and in view of the urgent necessity for flood relief in the Lower Colorado, development should not be allowed to further await

action by Arizona. The bill places no burden on Arizona that is not placed on each of the other States. Arizona is not required to approve the compact. She can make every use of the river and of the works provided in this bill that any other State can make and under exactly the same requirements as is made on the other States, namely, the use must be made subject to the terms of the compact.

As said by Mr. Hoover in testifying before the committee on March 3, 1926, in favor of the prompt authorization of this project:

I have felt that the public interest of the people involved is so great that the whole of this enormous work should not be held up because of this last remaining fraction of opposition.

All rights respecting water or power under the project are under the terms of the bill to be disposed of by contract by the Government. It is not reasonable to assume that the Government will do anything of an unfair or prejudicial nature to Arizona.

By going on with this important and urgent development the committee feels that soon the lower-basin States will reach such understandings that the seven-State ratification of the compact will become a reality, while any further delay in action will tend to a chaotic condition unfortunate alike to the upper and the lower basin States. There has already been four years of delay in development, in the hope that all matters might be adjusted between States. Any further delay will almost inevitably lead to an abandonment of interstate compact as a method of settling rights to the waters of the river and compel resort to other methods and processes, which under the circumstances would be highly unfortunate.

While the project here authorized is vital to many sections in the lower basin, the bill is no less important to upper-basin States. By giving congressional approval to the compact these States are assured in perpetuity water rights the value of which can not be overestimated. It is a mistake to think of this bill as one merely for the benefit of California or Nevada or Arizona. By "enthroning the Colorado River compact" it assures to the States of Colorado and New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming the water rights so essential to their future.

PART IV. FLOOD CONTROL

Throughout all the years of hearings on this development there has been expressed by all witnesses who have appeared before the committee an absolute unanimity of view respecting the existence of flood danger in the lower Colorado River, the urgent need for quick action, and that storage up the river is the solution of the flood problem. There has also been a like unanimity of opinion that the construction of the dam and storage at Boulder or Black Canyon, as here authorized, would furnish as complete a solution of the flood danger of the river as could possibly be accomplished.

This unanimity of sentiment was to be expected in view of the physical characteristics of the river, and particularly in view of the physical characteristics and situation of Imperial Valley in respect to the Colorado. Here is a great valley with 450,000 acres of irrigated farms, and with populous cities, lying in a great depression or sink from 100 to 300 feet below the channel of the river. The slope toward the valley is much greater than the slope toward the Gulf. Of course, the river at any flood time may break from its shifting and uncertain channel and turn into the valley. The flooding of Imperial Valley would not be like the flooding of other sections, where property damage and perhaps loss of life result, but where soon the water subsides. If the Colorado once breaks into the valley and is not returned to its channel it means its permanent inundation, there being no outlet for the water. The danger, ever present, of a great flood has led every responsible Government official who has ever studied the situation to promptly and earnestly recommend immediate steps to remove the danger of such a catastrophe.

LEVEES FURNISH INSUFFICIENT PROTECTION

Efforts toward the protection of Imperial Valley have been made through the construction of levees, with only partial success. In 1905 the river broke into Imperial Valley, and it took two years of heroic efforts and great expense to return the river to its channel toward the Gulf. The United States then expended approximately \$1,000,000 in building what was known as Ockerson Levee, in Mexico. Hardly was this levee completed until it was washed away. The river, which theretofore had been flowing almost due southward along the foot of a plateau in Arizona and Mexico, turned westward toward the Volcano Lake region, still in Mexican territory but in a lower depression on the delta. The river was kept in this course by an extensive levee system built by the people of Imperial Valley. Gradually, however, this depression filled up. The Imperial irrigation district then, at an expense of approximately \$700,000,

directed the river through what is known as the Pescadero Cut into a triangular depression lying between the old river channel on the east and the Volcano Lake region on the north and west. This is the one remaining depression on the surface of this delta into which the river can be directed.

The Imperial irrigation district is compelled to maintain a large and expensive organization for the building and maintenance of levees in Mexico. It has built 78 miles of these levees. The district has 60 miles of railroad, trains of dump cars, and other expensive equipment for keeping up these levees, which are ever being undermined and destroyed when the river is in flood.

SILT DEPOSITS AGGRAVATE FLOOD DANGER

Reference has already been made to the fact that the Colorado deposits below Yuma yearly more than 100,000 acre-feet of silt. The flood danger from the river is greatly aggravated by this silt, for it was the silt deposit that built the deltaic ridge on which the river now flows, filled the old channel of the river, and later filled the channel toward Volcano Lake. Indeed, any depression which the river finds in which to flow is quickly filled with silt.

Estimates differ as to how long it will take the river to fill up the Pescadero depression, through which it is now flowing. Some say 8 years; some say 20 years. No one knows for a certainty. All that is known is that within a comparatively short time it will be filled.

The situation thus adverted to was excellently described by Mr. A. P. Davis, former Director of the Reclamation Service, as follows:

In 1920 the situation became so critical that the district undertook at great expense to make a cut from the Bee River channel to the Pescadero and succeeded in diverting the river into that channel, where it now flows. We now have the condition of relatively high land along the Bee Channel and the levee on the north, running westward to Volcano Lake. We have another ridge which the river followed for a long time and built high running nearly south, from Yuma to the Gulf of California. Between these is a triangular tract which is lower than either, traversed by the Pescadero, in which the river is now flowing. It was testified here that it would take from 15 to 25 years to build up this delta as high as the Bee River ridge. No one can tell even approximately, but it may be assumed that this channel, like the Bee Channel, will begin to grow unstable in 10 or 12 years, though it may be possible to keep the river in its present vicinity considerably longer. It is certain, however, that the river will not fill every part of that triangle of low ground before it begins to give serious trouble.

We know also that the river is now busy in its filling job and will continue it without cessation until it is completed. It will then become again as threatening as it was in 1921, when Imperial Valley was fighting for its life to keep it from overtopping Volcano Lake levee. As soon as we provide a large desilting reservoir we will hold back the silt, and the building process will be checked. If this is done at once, we take advantage of the low areas, and with the silting process checked the river channel will become relatively permanent on low ground with no tendency to leave it. Some sediment will still come from the Gila, but it is certain that the building-up process will be made much slower and the menace of the river, regulated in flow, will be removed to a distant date.

If, on the contrary, the large desilting reservoir is postponed, as some people propose, the silting will continue until this basin is filled and the river again flowing on top of a ridge, ready to break loose with any freshet and threaten Imperial Valley as it did three years ago. It is clear that the desilting reservoir must be provided quickly, and it must be of large capacity and must form a permanent lake in which all sediment will settle. (Hearings on H. R. 2903, 68th Cong., p. 1379.)

No estimates have been made as to what the cost would be to dredge an artificial channel across the delta in Mexico after the Pescadero depression is filled. The cost would, of course, be enormous and doubtless beyond the resources of local communities. The work of so dredging and maintaining a channel would also be surrounded by almost insurmountable difficulties because of being in a foreign jurisdiction.

DAM AT BOULDER CANYON WILL TAKE CARE OF SILT

Almost all of the silt now being discharged by the river is picked up through the canyon section and above Boulder Canyon. The proposed great reservoir there will provide ample capacity for intercepting and storing the silt. More than 300 years would be required to fill the entire reservoir, and this even without the construction of other dams above. In the meantime, of course, other developments will occur further up the river which will intercept large portions of the silt discharge and thus prolong indefinitely the usefulness of this reservoir.

THE EFFECT OF FLOOD DANGER

The danger in which the Imperial Valley always stands of being flooded necessarily creates a feeling of uncertainty. Property values there are less than half of what the income from the property would justify. Money can be had only at excessive interest rates, while Federal farm-loan banks refuse to lend money on Imperial Valley farms.

PART V. RECLAMATION AND THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

The reclamation and all-American canal features of the project are so closely interrelated that they may most conveniently be considered together.

The only source of water for irrigation and domestic use in the region below Boulder Canyon, including a large area in Arizona and California, is the Colorado River and its tributaries. A substantial portion of the irrigable lands in Arizona and the Palo Verde and Imperial Valleys in California must rely wholly upon the main stream of the Colorado.

The low flow of the river is now completely utilized. The dam and reservoir at Boulder Canyon will store the flood waters of the river, now the source of the flood menace, and make these available for irrigation uses down the river. The lowest main storage reservoir will be forever dedicated to the satisfaction of irrigation uses of water, subject only to the superior use for flood control. In all there are approximately 1,500,000 acres of land in Arizona, Nevada, and California susceptible to irrigation by the waters which will thus be conserved. Of this amount, 550,000 acres, of which about 400,000 acres lie in Imperial Valley, are now irrigated from the river.

Of the new lands susceptible to irrigation and ready at the present time for reclamation, about 400,000 acres lie along the rim of the present irrigated area in Imperial Valley. About 250,000 acres of these are public lands and 11,000 acres Indian lands. These lands lie above the level of the present canal serving Imperial Valley. To serve these lands would require an all-American canal, but an all-American canal for the service of these lands alone would impose so great a burden of cost upon them as to be impracticable. Fortunately, the present irrigated area in the Imperial Valley is desirous of ending its present intolerable condition of being served by a canal running through Mexico and is ready to bear its share of the expense of an all-American canal built at an elevation to serve both the present irrigated areas and the other lands heretofore referred to.

This share of the expense is to be cared for by contract for water. By properly apportioning the cost of the all-American Canal, authorized by the bill, between the Imperial Irrigation district and these other lands, the benefits to be derived will greatly exceed the cost, making it a desirable and feasible undertaking and presenting an opportunity for the Government to reclaim its own lands under favorable and workable conditions.

CHARACTERISTICS AND CROPS OF IMPERIAL VALLEY AND ADJACENT SECTIONS

Here the summers are hot and the winters are mild. The principal crops are lettuce, peas, spinach, and other vegetables, cantaloupes, grapes, citrus fruits, and strawberries. The warm climate makes it possible to produce all of these at a very early season, and great quantities are shipped to the eastern markets.

Generally speaking, because of the climatic conditions, the products of this section are not seriously in competition with the farm products of other portions of the United States. Most of the products of this region can not be produced elsewhere at the time of year produced there.

The rim lands referred to above, and which may be brought under irrigation by the all-American Canal, are of the same character as the lands now under successful irrigation in the valley. Their reclamation is in no sense experimental.

DROUGHT

The flood danger to Imperial Valley is obvious and acute. Hardly less serious, however, is the danger of drought, due to increased uses of water in the upper States, and particularly to the rapidly increasing irrigation uses in Mexico.

When the development of Imperial Valley was first conceived it was thought impossible to undertake the expense of building a canal all in the United States to furnish water to the valley. Hence, advantage was taken of an old river channel and the canal was built, taking water from the Colorado River just above the boundary line, and thence meandering through Mexico for a long distance before returning to the valley. This canal was built in Mexico by a Mexican corporation under a concession by the terms of which lands in Mexico were entitled to "one-half of the volume of water passing through the canal." At this early date there was little or no irrigation in Mexico. Since that time irrigation has increased very rapidly

in Mexico, much more rapidly of late years than in the Imperial Valley in the United States. This appears from the following table, showing by years the acreage irrigated in the United States and in Mexico from the existing main canal:

Year	United States	Mexico	Total
1908	141,030	6,935	147,965
1909	160,470	9,051	169,521
1910	181,191	14,920	196,111
1911	201,782	14,953	216,735
1912	220,511	21,599	242,110
1913	242,036	33,761	275,797
1914	277,232	39,600	316,832
1915	293,534	41,000	334,534
1916	308,009	67,500	375,509
1917	367,020	118,530	485,550
1918	413,440	136,580	550,020
1919	414,720	190,000	604,720
1920	410,070	120,000	530,070
1921	413,400	150,000	563,400
1922	415,000	180,000	595,000
1923	413,832	185,022	598,854
1924	400,000	217,000	617,000
1925			

¹ Estimated.

There are approximately 800,000 acres of land in Mexico susceptible of irrigation by gravity from the present main canal.

Already there are more lands being irrigated from this canal than may reliably be cared for by the available water in the river. As said by Mr. M. G. Dowd, chief engineer of the Imperial Irrigation district, in November, 1925, when testifying before the Senate committee—

There is no question but that even with the present irrigated acreage in Mexico the area now in crop in the United States is larger than it should be if losses are to be avoided from water shortages during the low flow of the river. Mexico has been using for several years past more than one-half of the water diverted from the river for beneficial use during July and August. As an example, take those two months for the present year: During July we delivered 144,236 acre-feet to users in Mexico and 117,589 acre-feet to users in the United States; during August the respective amounts were 139,292 and 102,442 acre-feet. With the additional 100,000 acres mentioned above, Mexico will acquire half the water diverted during longer periods of the low flow of the river, increasing the frequency and length of water shortages. This means that there will be that much less available for the lands in the United States than was the case heretofore during these periods when the acreage across the line was not large enough to demand half the water for any great length of time.

It will be observed from the table inserted above that for the last six years there has been practically no increase in the irrigated areas in the Imperial Valley. In Mexico, however, there has been an increase in the irrigated acreage of nearly 100 per cent, the acreage mounting from 118,530 acres in 1913 to 217,000 in 1925. Soon there will be another 100,000 acres of land brought under water in Mexico, this being the additional acreage referred to by Mr. Dowd. This spells disaster for ranchers in Imperial Valley.

As well expressed by the Secretary of the Interior in his report to this committee on January 12, 1926:

The canal now supplies water for the irrigation of over 400,000 acres in California, and irrigators in Mexico at present require water for the irrigation of 200,000 acres. But Mexican irrigators are entitled, under this concession, to double the volume they are now using, or for enough to irrigate as many acres as are now irrigated in California. That is more water than the unregulated flow of the river will now supply. As the Mexican irrigators are on the upper end of the canal, the pinch of scarcity, when it has come in the past, or when it may come in the future, falls first on irrigators in the United States, which country supplies the water, all the construction cost, and all the money advanced for operation. It is unfair to California irrigators now, and will be even more so after the reservoir is built.

It is physically possible to irrigate much more than 400,000 acres from this canal in Mexico. If this concession remains in force without any amendment and the canal continues to be used as now, the irrigated area in Mexico will continue to extend. The volume needed to be diverted from the river would be more than the direct flow at the low-water season, and the area irrigated in California would be subject to ruinous uncertainties and loss. If storage is provided, a part of the water for the irrigation of lands in Mexico would, under this concession, have to be supplied from the reservoir, as this canal would be the only means of conveying water to the Imperial Valley, and it can be operated only if the terms of the Mexican concession are complied with.

That Imperial Valley is in actual danger of drought is no vague fear. In 1924 all of the water of the river was diverted into the Imperial Canal for 96 days. After Mexican require-

ments had been met there was not enough left for the proper irrigation of farms in the valley, and crop losses of not less than \$5,000,000 were suffered from an actual water shortage. For several days during that period there was barely sufficient water for stock and domestic purposes.

OPERATIONS IN MEXICO UNSATISFACTORY

For an American community such as has grown up in Imperial Valley to be dependent entirely for its water supply for domestic use and irrigation upon a canal running 60 miles through Mexico is necessarily highly unsatisfactory. It has been cryptically said:

I would not want my jugular vein running through any foreign country.

The canal serving Imperial Valley with water is in truth and fact the jugular vein of the community which has there sprung up.

Again, if with American capital upon American soil the storm waters of the river are conserved, as they will be at Boulder Canyon, it would be highly unfortunate and contrary to sound policy if for every acre in Imperial Valley brought under irrigation and served by these waters a like amount of land would have to be developed and served in Mexico. This is just what conservation of the waters of the Colorado River without an all-American canal means; and this is what the Secretary of the Interior well expressed in the portion of his report heretofore quoted. To relieve the Imperial Valley from danger of drought, by storage alone, would make Mexico a chief beneficiary of the project. By adding the all-American canal this untoward result is avoided.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL GIVES UNITED STATES STRATEGIC CONTROL OF THE WATERS OF THE COLORADO

Through the control of the release of waters stored at the dam and through the control of an all-American canal the United States will be in a position to regulate absolutely the extent to which the waters of the Colorado River will be available for use in Mexico.

CANAL INTEGRAL PART OF PROJECT

In order to protect American interests, to remove international difficulties and complications which now exist, to give the United States a strategic control of American waters, and to bring additional lands, mostly public, under irrigation under the only feasible plan of so doing, the all-American canal is an essential and indispensable part of this project. By the plan of the bill it is not set aside as an unrelated part of the development. The financing must cover not only the cost of the dam and the power plants if they are built, but the cost of the canal. The bill does not specify how these various costs shall be spread. All that is required is that contracts for the storage and delivery of water and power must fully cover the cost of all works, with interest. It will be for the Secretary to fairly apportion these costs as between water for irrigation and domestic use and power.

PART VI. DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY

The relation of the matter of domestic water supply to the project here authorized is important. First, it assures beyond question of doubt the financial integrity of the project. The largest agency, which by contract will assume the obligation of reimbursing the Government for the cost of the project with interest, will undoubtedly be a public district, comprising a large group of cities in southern California, which will contract both for storage of water at the dam, with its delivery at a point on the river, and also for a large block of the power necessary to pump a domestic water supply to an elevation of 1,200 or 1,300 feet. Second, the project is so shaped that it will make possible the securing of a domestic water supply. Other plans of development tentatively suggested have not been adequate to this end.

The coastal belt of southern California, having a population at present of more than 1,800,000, is fast reaching the limit of its available domestic supply, and careful investigations have shown that the populous cities of this coastal plain, including the city of Los Angeles, must for their own security acquire an added source of domestic water supply, and that the Colorado presents the only place where this may be secured.

Some years ago the city of Los Angeles went to Owens Valley and constructed a great aqueduct 240 miles in length to augment local sources. Even this added supply is not proving sufficient for the needs of that city.

Nearly two years ago that city voted a bond issue of \$2,000,000 for preliminary surveys and investigation respecting the securing of a supply from the Colorado River, and enough work has already been done to fully establish the feasi-

bility of the plan, if and provided there is large storage of the flood waters of the river.

The formation of a large public district, comprising the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, Orange County cities, and such other cities as desire to join, is contemplated for the purpose of building the necessary aqueduct from the river to the coast to supply these cities with domestic water. This aqueduct will be approximately 250 miles in length and cost around \$150,000,000. Because of intervening mountain ranges it will be necessary to pump the water some 1,300 feet. While this will be costly, a cheap and dependable source of power will not only reduce the financial burden but is necessary to make the project at all feasible.

The amount of water required by these cities is 1,500 second-feet. This, of course, will not all be necessary at once, but as these cities are growing rapidly they must look to the future and provide for their vital necessities.

To raise a full 1,500 second-feet to an elevation of 1,300 feet will ultimately require approximately 250,000 firm horsepower of electricity. This district will be an applicant for a contract for a substantial block of power at the dam, enough to handle the necessary pumping for a reasonable period in the future, but having in view the fact that as market conditions demand there will doubtless be other power developments on the Colorado River.

Large storage at Boulder Canyon is ideally fitted to make it possible for these cities to procure a domestic water supply. The capacity of the reservoir is sufficiently large that there may be obtained enough storage to protect against dry years or against the upper basin States retaining all or substantially all of the flow of the river during a period of dry years. Full conservation thus effected will permit of the utilization of water for a domestic supply without impinging upon irrigation requirements. The dam and reservoir also accomplish certain desilting processes essential to successful consummation of the plan of securing domestic water supply.

PART VII. POWER

Power may well be described as the burden bearer of the project here authorized.

A low flood-control dam, which would cost approximately two-thirds of the dam here authorized, would represent an outlay by the Federal Treasury which could not be recovered. By providing for a dam of the height here authorized, not only will the floods of the river be fully conserved, reclamation uses fully provided for, and opportunity afforded to populous cities of the coast to secure a necessary domestic water supply, but hydroelectric power will be made available in such amount and of such desirability as will easily bear a major portion of the cost of the entire development.

An eager market awaits this power. Private utilities would secure a part of it. The great district contemplating a water supply will desire a very substantial part; cities like Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, Riverside are eager applicants. States contiguous to the dam will want their share. In short there can be no doubt that all the power will be contracted for at once.

It is not strange that this is so, for the power will be desirable power. According to the estimates of the Reclamation Service, if the Government builds the power plants it can be sold at the switchboard at 3 mills per kilowatt hour, and this price will take care of all operating and maintenance expense, interest on the cost of the all-American canal, and with revenues from sale of water insure the retirement of the entire investment of the Government with interest within a period of 25 years.

There will become available upon the construction of the dam 550,000 firm or constant horsepower. Conditions indicate that this would be used upon a 55 per cent load factor, calling for the installation at the dam of plants with an installed capacity of 1,000,000 horsepower. These plants will be installed in units of approximately 100,000 horsepower. Units can, of course, be installed as the market calls for power. Furthermore, some of the power will be available while the dam is in course of construction. Thus the release of this large amount of power will not come in one block but only gradually as it can be absorbed by the market.

There were many indications in the testimony adduced before the committee that there would be considerable competition to secure this very desirable power. The committee has so framed the legislation to guard as fully as might be against this asset, created by Federal initiative, being monopolized by any one agency. The bill contemplates that the power will be fairly and equitably distributed amongst the various agencies applying therefor, thus insuring the widest and fairest possible distribution of the benefits.

PART VIII. FORM OF BILL

The pending bill has been given consideration commensurate with the great project it authorizes and the various purposes its enactment will accomplish.

It has undergone many changes and improvements. New ideas have been advanced. These as they have proved sound have been incorporated. The financial plan was prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury. Provisions to settle water rights on the river have come largely from the official representatives of upper-basin States. Valuable suggestions have originated in Federal departments having to do with the development.

The project is an intricate one. One phase has its effect upon another and apparently unrelated aspect. Each phase has been carefully covered by the bill without impinging upon any other phase.

Approximately one-third of the bill deals with the matter of interstate water rights and the Colorado River compact, and approximately one-quarter of it deals with the financial features. As to the administration of the project, this has not been burdened with undue details. Necessarily something must be left to responsible administrative agencies. This has been done, and the Secretary of the Interior, who is charged with the duty of financing and managing the development, is given a reasonable leeway in arranging contracts, fixing prices, and allocating benefits. This is illustrated in the optional provisions respecting power. The Secretary may lease the right to use water at the dam or he may construct plants and sell power at the switchboard, as may seem best to him, to the end that he may meet the requirement of completely financing the project, and this largely through the disposition of power or power rights. Fundamentals are covered. Details are appropriately left to be worked out by the Secretary.

CONCLUSION

This bill should be passed because—

First. Congress should no longer risk a flood catastrophe to Imperial Valley—a catastrophe which further delay only courts.

Second. Reclamation possibilities in the lower basin should be safeguarded and taken care of before it is too late. Unless something is done, the river will be acquired for power development exclusively. Mexico is constantly building up added claims to its waters.

Third. The Mexican situation must be met. It is not sound policy to allow a condition to continue by which that country may and will go on using more and more water from the river, and this at the expense of existing and future irrigation in the United States.

Fourth. The Government should aid its people to secure their necessities in the way of domestic water supply, where it can do so, as here, without cost and as an incident in carrying out other Federal purposes such as river regulation and reclamation.

Fifth. It will convert a natural menace into a national asset.

Sixth. A financial scheme is presented by which the development will be completely prefinanced, thus fully protecting the Federal Treasury and the general taxpayer.

Seventh. It settles in large part water rights between States in a sensible and practical way, substituting interstate agreements for interminable litigation and controversy. Further delay points to the latter untoward results and the disintegration of the plan of settling water rights by interstate compact.

Attention is invited to the following letter from the Secretary of the Interior explaining the legislation in detail and estimating the cost and the revenues that will be produced:

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO CHAIRMAN SMITH
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 18, 1926.

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Chairman Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I have received your letter of January 14, transmitting, with request for report, a copy of H. R. 6251, entitled "A bill to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin."

Instead of discussing the provisions of this bill section by section, I desire to submit some suggestions regarding the policy and procedure to be followed in this development and the legislation required to secure the desired results. It is assumed that the dam and reservoir to be created are essentially those described in a report of the Bureau of Reclamation dated February 28, 1924, which proposes a dam 550 feet high and a reservoir to impound 26,000,000 acre-feet of water, and that the all-American canal for connecting the Colorado River with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys is substantially the one described in Senate Docu-

ment No. 142 and in the report of the all-American canal board, published in 1920.

It is my understanding that the primary purpose of this scheme is to regulate and control the flow of the river below the dam so as to lessen the menace from floods to low-lying land below; to increase the water supply for irrigation in seasons of drought and provide an adequate water supply at all seasons of the year for household and industrial uses in growing cities and towns; and to generate electric energy both as a means of making this project a financially solvent undertaking and contributing to the general prosperity of the southwestern part of the country. The general plan and purpose of this measure has my support, and I favor it being made a national undertaking, to be carried out and administered by the Federal Government.

Interstate and international rights and interests involve the diversified benefits from the construction of these works, the waiting necessities of cities for increased water supplies, the large development of latent agricultural resources, the protection of these already developed and the immense industrial benefits which may come from the production of cheap power, which together appear to render the construction and subsequent control of these works a measure of such economic and social importance that no agency but the Federal Government should be intrusted with the protection of rights or distribution of its opportunities. All uses can be coordinated and the fullest benefits realized only by their centralized control.

I shall therefore consider this development as including three features:

(1) A dam approximately 550 feet high creating a reservoir holding 26,000,000 acre-feet of water.

(2) Works for the generation of electric power.

(3) An all-American canal starting at Laguna Dam and delivering water to the Imperial and Coachella Valley canals.

The reservoir should be regulated primarily to safeguard the valleys in Arizona and California, including Imperial Valley, with its present extensive development, from the destructive effect of large floods. Water levels in the reservoir would be raised during flood periods and lowered at other times, thus equalizing the discharge of the river below and securing a regulated flow for irrigation and power. The water so impounded should be sold to cities requiring it for domestic purposes and other municipal uses and to irrigation districts, like that of the Imperial Valley, desiring a complete or supplemental water supply under the provisions of the Warren Act, payment to be made for a definite volume of water each year.

The electric energy generated should be sold to the highest and best bidders, with due regard to public interest, at the switchboard of the power plant. Contracts should not exceed 50 years in duration. Transmission of power and its distribution to be provided by the purchasers.

Water supplied for domestic, industrial, or irrigation uses should be delivered at the dam, at points along the river agreed upon, and at the terminal of the all-American canal. Prices for this water should be such as to at least repay all of the cost of operation and maintenance of the canals and an equitable part of the operating expenses of the dam. This, with the revenues from power, will, we believe, repay the entire investment in this development, with 4 per cent interest.

The money for this development should, I believe, be provided by a bond issue of the United States. It should be for a sum sufficient to provide for the construction of the dam, the power plant, and the all-American canal. An additional sum should be included in the authorization to pay interest on bonds sold during the period of construction and until such time as the revenue will meet interest charges. Providing the money for this development through a special bond issue will obviate disturbance of the regular fiscal operations of the Government. It will obviate provision by the Budget for the money needed during construction. The bonds could be sold as money would be needed. Construction would extend over a period of between 5 and 10 years if work were carried on at a rate to secure the greatest efficiency.

In the sale of water to irrigation districts and municipalities the provisions of the reclamation act and of the Warren Act would apply.

Such an adjustment of burdens and benefits should stimulate irrigation development because of the generous terms on which water will be supplied and at the same time result in a considerable revenue from the water furnished for irrigation, domestic, and industrial uses. But the money-earning feature of this development is power. The revenue from the sale of power will, it is believed, alone repay the entire cost of these works with interest at 4 per cent.

With this general outline of the development program favored I submit comments on features of the bill which are approved and others which it is believed should be modified.

The necessity for the all-American canal and the size and cost of this canal depend largely on whether the existing concession under which water is now diverted from the Colorado River at Hanlons Heading and carried through Mexico to irrigators in the Imperial Valley can be modified. If it can not be, then the all-American canal becomes an indispensable part of this development. Under this contract or con-

cession the Mexican Government gave a corporation permission to build and operate a canal across Mexican territory to irrigate land in California on condition that Mexican irrigators be given, if they desire it, one-half of all the water diverted into this canal from the Colorado River. Hence the canal has to be double the capacity required to meet the needs of California. The river has to supply double the water needed in California, and the rights of Mexicans to water under this concession grow as the irrigated area is extended in California.

The canal now supplies water for the irrigation of over 400,000 acres in California, and irrigators in Mexico at present require water for the irrigation of 200,000 acres. But Mexican irrigators are entitled under this concession to double the volume they are now using, or for enough to irrigate as many acres as are now irrigated in California. That is more water than the unregulated flow of the river will now supply. As the Mexican irrigators are on the upper end of the canal, the pinch of scarcity, when it has come in the past or when it may come in the future, falls first on irrigators in the United States, which country supplies the water, all the construction cost, and all the money advanced for operation. It is unfair to California irrigators now and will be even more so after the reservoir is built.

It is physically possible to irrigate much more than 400,000 acres from this canal in Mexico. If this concession remains in force without any amendment and the canal continues to be used as now, the irrigated area in Mexico will continue to extend. The volume needed to be diverted from the river would be more than the direct flow at the low-water season, and the area irrigated in California would be subject to ruinous uncertainties and loss. If storage is provided, a part of the water for the irrigation of lands in Mexico would, under this concession, have to be supplied from the reservoir, as this canal would be the only means of conveying water to the Imperial Valley, and it can be operated only if the terms of the Mexican concession are complied with.

If, however, the Government of Mexico would consent to a modification of this concession and definitely limit the volume of water to which Mexican irrigators would be entitled, then the future use of the present canal would be economical and desirable, a smaller high line could be built and utilized mainly for the irrigation of the higher lands of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. Thus far no negotiations for the modification of this concession have been made. It is not known what the attitude of the Mexican Government would be, and plans for this development should, therefore, include provision for an all-American canal as an essential part of the scheme.

The building of a unified power plant by the Federal Government in the place of allocating power privileges, as proposed in the bill, is regarded as more efficient and cheaper. It will obviate controversies between applicants and long delays in their adjustment. In the end, results will, I believe, be superior to those possible under an allocation of privileges. The area for the location of separate power sites is restricted. Allotments would not be equal in value. Some allottees would, therefore, have an advantage over others. It would result in the creation of operation and administration controversies to be avoided and which a unified development will avert.

The transmission lines for the distribution and retailing of this power should be financed by its purchasers. To secure the greatest economy main transmission lines leading to different localities should be constructed for joint use. This plan of power development is not an experiment. It has been adopted by the Government with satisfactory results in the construction of other reclamation works where the generation of power is an incident to irrigation development. Salt River, Minidoka, Lahontan, and Guernsey are illustrations.

Section 6 provides that no part of the construction cost of the dam and the appurtenant works shall be charged against any lands irrigated by the waters of the reservoir. If the all-American canal is to be considered as an appurtenant work, the bill should be amended. It is believed that the sales of water from this canal will return not only the cost of operation and maintenance but pay construction costs without interest, as is done on other reclamation projects.

All revenues from power, irrigation, and domestic water supplies should be placed in a common fund and used for the payment of interest,

¹ The Sociedad de Riego y Terrenos de la Baja California S. A. is authorized to carry through the canal which it has built in Mexican territory, and through other canals that it may build, if convenient, water to an amount of 284 cubic meters (10,000 cubic feet) per second from the waters taken from the Colorado River in territory of the United States by the California Development Co., and which waters this company has ceded to the Sociedad de Riego y Terrenos de la Baja California S. A. It is also authorized to carry to the lands of the United States the water with the exception of that mentioned in the following article. From the water mentioned in the foregoing article, enough shall be used to irrigate the lands susceptible of irrigation in Lower California with the water carried through the canal or canals, without in any case the amount of water used exceeding one-half of the volume of water passing through said canals.

operating expenses, and build up a sinking fund for redeeming the entire bond issue.

In order to give assurance before any large expenditure is incurred that the anticipated revenues from this development will be obtained, the bill should contain a provision that before any bonds are issued and sold, and before awarding any contracts for construction, the Secretary of the Interior shall secure the execution of contracts with irrigation districts, municipalities, and corporations, on terms to be fixed, for the delivery of all water to be supplied for irrigation, domestic, and municipal uses, and shall obtain definite commitment for the purchase of power from responsible bidders in an amount to insure a sufficient return from this development to repay the money to be expended, with interest, within a period of 50 years.

Section 8, which provides for the distribution and use of all water for irrigation, power, and otherwise, in accordance with the Colorado River compact, seems well conceived and is a necessary part of this legislation. This appears to afford ample protection and assurance to those States included in the upper division of the watershed against the creation of a priority of right through the building of these works which would impair in any way their right to the volume of water guaranteed to that division in the compact. I suggest for consideration amendment to the effect that the benefits to be derived from this development shall be available only to those States or the citizens of those States which have ratified the compact.

I suggest the amendment of section 9, as follows: In line 1, page 11, strike out the words "the proportionate share," and insert in lieu thereof the words "an equitable share in accordance with the benefits received." After the word "lands" in line 15 insert "subject, however, to the provisions of subsection C of section 4, act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702)." The first amendment suggested is designed to avoid the necessity of fixing a flat-rate charge without regard to the classification or quality of the land. Experience has shown that a flat-rate charge is undesirable in some cases. The second amendment I believe of prime importance. If soldiers and sailors are to be given a preference, experience has shown that provision should be made for selection. This is desirable for the protection of all prospective entrymen, soldiers, and sailors, as well as civilians.

Since section 1 provides for the building of a dam either at Black Canyon or Boulder Canyon, I suggest that line 11, section 10, be amended so as to designate the subfund there mentioned as the "Colorado River dam fund," which would be applicable in either case. The present designation might possibly prove a misnomer. I suggest the following proviso be inserted at the end of section 10 of the bill:

"Provided, however, That no work shall be begun and no moneys expended on or in connection with the works or structures provided for in this act until the respective legislatures of at least six of the signatory States mentioned in section 13 hereof shall have approved the Colorado River compact mentioned in said section 13 and shall have consented to a waiver of the provision of the first paragraph of article 11 of said compact making the same binding and obligatory when it shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of the seven signatory States, and until the President by public proclamation shall have declared that the said compact has been approved by and become binding and obligatory upon at least six of the signatory States."

An approximate estimate of costs, operating expenses, and income leaves no question as to the ultimate solvency of this undertaking if carried out along the lines proposed. The main source of revenue will be power, and the rate assumed is lower than the wholesale prices now being paid in the West. Those of which we have information range from 3½ to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour, measured at the switchboard. As the largest consumers of this power would be distant, a low figure of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour at the switchboard has been assumed in the estimates which follow:

Colorado River Development—Boulder Canyon Reservoir, all-American canal

CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Estimated cost for—	
26,000,000 acre-foot reservoir.....	\$41,500,000
1,000,000-horsepower development.....	31,500,000
The all-American canal.....	31,000,000
Interest during construction on above, 5 years, at 4 per cent.....	21,000,000
Total.....	125,000,000

ANNUAL OPERATION

Estimated gross revenues from—	
Sale 3.6 billion kilowatt-hours power at 3 cent.....	10,800,000
Storage and delivery of water for irrigation and domestic purposes.....	1,500,000
Total.....	12,300,000
Estimated fixed annual charges for—	
Operation and maintenance, storage and power.....	700,000
Operation and maintenance, all-American canal.....	500,000
Interest on \$125,000,000 at 4 per cent.....	5,000,000
Total.....	6,200,000

Estimated annual surplus, \$6,100,000, or thought to be sufficient to repay the entire cost in 25 years.

The height of this dam as fixed will not prevent the construction of the proposed dams at Diamond Creek or Bridge Canyon. The approval of this project should open the way for other development and encourage the construction of projects above this dam for development of irrigation, power, or other purposes.

Although the difficulties of construction and magnitude of the proposed structure, compared with any other for similar purposes, are unprecedented, assuming that it is a feasible engineering possibility, the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior as now organized, with its present commissioner, is competent to construct the works contemplated in S. 1868.

With the amendments suggested, I recommend the favorable consideration of this bill by Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

HUBERT WORK.

RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may have time to receive the Interior Department appropriation bill and send it to conference in case it shall be passed to-day by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand at recess subject to the call of the Speaker, and that the Speaker have the teller bell sounded 15 minutes before he intends to call the House to order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman ask that we stand in recess to a definite time, say, 3 o'clock or 3 o'clock and 30 minutes?

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman should understand the difficulty in doing it that way, because the Senate may finish the bill within half an hour and it may not finish it until 4 o'clock.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman wants to keep us here subject to the call of the bell.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Texas need not be here at that time unless he wishes to be here.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but it is our duty to be present when this House meets.

Mr. TILSON. But the gentleman now knows that there is but one thing to be done. If the gentleman has any objection to that action, he may so state at this time, and then there would be no occasion to take a recess.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think anybody would object to the gentleman's request if he would make it to a definite time. That is the usual custom.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman wishes to be brought back here again and again—possibly two or three times—it might be well to take his suggestion.

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest the gentleman make it 3.30 or 4 o'clock.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from Texas will not insist upon that definite time, because that might bring the Members of the House here possibly an hour before there would be any reason for their assembling.

Mr. TILSON. That is what I am trying to avoid, and also the possibility of bringing them back here time and time again. I am trying to avoid the loss of possibly an hour or so in case that bill should be passed quickly and be ready to be sent to conference. These are my reasons for making the time of the recess elastic.

Mr. CRAMTON. Furthermore, there would be the possibility that action might be required by the Senate after our action, and that would be holding the Senate up as well as this body.

Mr. TILSON. Precisely. It seems to me that if the Members are willing to agree to my proposal, it would make it very much more convenient and might save considerable time.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, would the gentleman have it made 30 minutes instead of 15 minutes before the Speaker calls the House to order that the bell should be rung, because there are places in the city from which it would take 30 minutes to reach the House.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, and at the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas, ask that 30 minutes before the Speaker intends to call the House to order he have the teller bell sounded, and that we now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the teller bell be sounded 30 minutes before the Chair calls the House to order. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would it not be well for the gentleman from Connecticut to include in that request an understanding that nothing will

be brought up except the proposition of sending the interior bill to conference?

Mr. TILSON. That is my intention. I shall call up nothing else, and I hope that the Speaker, unless required to do so by the rules, will not recognize anyone for any other purpose.

Mr. MAPES. It seems to me, in view of the peculiar position that we are in, that we ought to have a very definite understanding to that effect, and then the Members of the House will not need to pay any further attention to it.

Mr. TILSON. It is just as definite as can be made, I think. The floor leader will not bring up anything else and will not permit anything else to be brought up if he can prevent it, and I think the Speaker will be in accord with the floor leader in this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the House stands in recess subject to the conditions named.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired (at 4 o'clock p. m.), the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments to the Interior Department appropriation bill be disagreed to, that a conference be requested, and the conferees appointed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14827, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado as conferees on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to the enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4742. An act providing for the promotion of Floyd Bennett, aviation pilot, United States Navy, and awarding to him a congressional medal of honor.

S. 4741. An act providing for the promotion of Lieut. Commander Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy, retired, and awarding to him a congressional medal of honor.

S. 4153. An act to provide for enlarging and relocating the United States Botanic Garden, and for other purposes.

S. 3728. An act to grant to the State of New York and the Seneca Nation of Indians jurisdiction over the taking of fish and game within the Allegany, Cattaraugus, and Oil Spring Indian Reservations.

S. 3615. An act for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the Spanish-American War because of misrepresentation of age.

HOLIDAY ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the terms of the concurrent resolution, I move that the House do now adjourn until Monday, January 3, 1927, at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.). The House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock Monday, January 3, 1927.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 23, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department and independent offices appropriation bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the papers in the pension case of Lottie A. Bowhall, and the papers in the claim for pension of Cora A. Moore, with a view to consideration of the repeal of so much of the act as grants pension to said Lottie A. Bowhall on the ground that the beneficiary obtained pension under such special act by fraud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

818. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, for the laying of water mains and for an addition to Reno Reservoir, \$250,000, to be added to the estimate of \$450,000 (H. Doc. No. 606); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

819. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, amounting to a total of \$310,193.33 (H. Doc. No. 607); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

820. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Commission of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, in the amount of \$14,000 (H. Doc. No. 608); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

821. A letter from the chairman of the War Finance Corporation, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the War Finance Corporation (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

822. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the work performed and expenditures made during the fiscal year 1926 in the construction of forest highways and forest development roads and trails; to the Committee on Roads.

823. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report in connection with the administration of certain sections of the transportation act, 1920, and a draft of a bill appropriating \$48,852.83 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to refund the amount of interest erroneously collected from certain railroads on overpayments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, consisting of five items amounting to \$2,027,000 (H. Doc. No. 609); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13016. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundred and sixth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13067. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or Roosevelt County, or McCone County, in the State of Montana, or either or several of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA of California: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13070. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Henry L. Gray and Elbert M. Chandler, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13452. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Wabash River; with amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13455. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Ashland Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13456. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Dwight P. Robinson & Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; with amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14236. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14239. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Meridian and Bigbee River Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Naheola, Ala.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1653). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14246. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Maysville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14688. A bill to authorize the building of a bridge across the Waccamaw River in South Carolina; with amendment (Rept. No. 1655). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. J. Res. 292. A joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Burlington, N. J.," approved May 21, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 1656). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 9826. A bill to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15468. A bill to authorize payment of compensation to retired warrant officers and enlisted men employed by the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15475. A bill amending the act approved August 30, 1890 (Stat. L., vol. 26, pp. 412, 413), relative to proceedings for condemnation of land for public purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15601) to conserve the revenues from medicinal spirits and provide for the effective Government control of such spirits, to prevent the evasion of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 15602) to amend the last paragraph of an act entitled "An act to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 15603) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement or agreements with the State of Montana and private owners of lands within the State of Montana for grazing and range development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 15604) for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 15605) to provide for the establishment of a postal guard service in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 15606) to regulate interstate commerce by motor vehicles operating as common carriers on the public highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15607) to provide a code of law governing legal reserve life insurance business in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 313) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce through the various and

suitable bureaus in the Department of Commerce to make investigations, with a view of developing new uses for cotton and cotton products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREW: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) directing and providing for the assembly, inventory, classification, preparation for publication, and publication of the official records and maps relating to the participation of the military and naval forces of the United States in the World War, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) designating the columbine as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 351) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the Bridge and Whist Club operated by Ralph W. Bickle and A. Bruce Bielaski, in the city of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 15608) for the relief of Gilbert P. Chase; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 15609) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Donley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 15610) for the relief of the owners of the steam barge *Genessee* and the barge *J. Mooney*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARPENTER: A bill (H. R. 15611) granting an increase of pension to Martha Viola Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15612) for the relief of William F. Sponenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 15613) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Brister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 15614) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Brownfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 15615) granting an increase of pension to Frances Evaline Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15616) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 15617) to provide for the retirement of Donald G. Wetterauer as a first sergeant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 15618) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Finn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15619) granting an increase of pension to Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 15620) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Runion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15621) granting a pension to Mattie Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 15622) granting an increase of pension to Annie Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 15623) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide H. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 15624) for the relief of Andrew McLaughlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 15625) granting an increase of pension to Ida Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 15626) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stephens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 15627) granting an increase of pension to Ellen McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 15628) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Butterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 15629) for the relief of Erasmus J. Booth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 15630) granting a pension to Benjamin Ferrier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 15631) granting an increase of pension to Orinda L. Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15632) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Freese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15633) to correct the military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 15634) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Eagy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15635) granting an increase of pension to Theresa P. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 15636) for the relief of Mrs. Charles Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15637) for the relief of David Parrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15638) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 15639) granting an increase of pension to Achsah E. Purinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15640) granting a pension to James M. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4397. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolutions adopted by the Medical Society of the State of New York, expressing opposition to Senate bill 4085 and House bill 11612, which measures seek to amend the Harrison narcotic law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4398. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolutions of the Bozeman Woman's Club, of Bozeman, Mont., protesting against the proposed elimination of an area in the southwestern corner of Yellowstone National Park to be used as a reservoir; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4399. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, with reference to secure fertilizers at a lower cost and in more concentrated form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

MONDAY, January 3, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, with whom there is no variableness nor shadow of turning, Thou art the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. We deal with so much that is uncertain in life that we come to Thee this morning grateful for Thy blessings during the past year and ask from Thee guidance through this year. Enable us to see things from the standard of Thine own invitation and guidance and thus direct our ways that we may honor Thee in all things. We humbly beg in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

PETER NORBECK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 22, 1926, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3615. An act for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the Spanish-American War because of misrepresentation of age;